REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on December 2, 2004, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-2, 4-20, and 22-39 are now pending in this Application. Claims 1, 14, 19, 32, 37 and 38 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. In this Amendment, claims 1, 16, 17, 19, 37 and 38 have been amended and claims 3 and 21 have been cancelled. Claim 39 has been added. Applicants believe that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13, 19-31, 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,167,448 to Hemphill et al. (hereinafter Hemphill) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,786 to Connelly et al. (hereinafter Connelly). Applicant(s) respectfully disagree(s) with these contentions and assert that the present claimed invention is not anticipated by any disclosure in the Hemphill and/or Connelly references.

Hemphill discloses, at column 2, lines 30-37, a device for delivery of event-related information of a managed device to a management server of a network, and the use of XML to provide a flexible scheme for encoding management information in response to a management event.

Connelly discloses, at column 3, lines 23-30, a fault tolerant method of monitoring one or more computers for availability and further including generating an event when a computer system detects a change in status that affects availability. Neither Hemphill nor Connelly, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the use of an event message wherein the event message contains event registration information.

In contrast to Hemphill and Connelly, claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitation included in claim 3 that the event message contains event registration information. Event registration information is defined in the specification as filed at page 5, lines 13-25; at page 8 lines 16-24; and at page 13, line 20 through page 15 line 5; that the event registration information

indicates, for example, a specific company, product, module (e.g., software module) or other information that identifies a source or sources of forthcoming event data as well as event information that the event processing server will require in order to be able to correctly process the forthcoming event data. Neither Hemphill nor Connelly, taken alone or in combination, discloses the same. The Examiner stated, in the rejection of claim 3, that Hemphill discloses event registration information, however Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement. In particular, the Examiner stated that EAS files disclosed at column 10, line 32 through column 11, line 10 discloses event registration information. A careful review of Hemphill discloses that the EAS files is an Event Action Script which is an executable script that allows the specification of actions that should be taken, which is quite different than event registration information which is information that identifies a source or sources of forthcoming event data as well as event information that the event processing server will require in order to be able to correctly process the forthcoming event data.

Accordingly, since claim 1 discloses that the event message contains event registration information while Hemphill and Connelly fail to disclose or suggest the same, amended claim 1 is beloved allowable over Hemphill and Connelly. Claims 19, 37 and 38 has been amended in a similar fashion as claim 1 and are believed allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 3 and 21 have been cancelled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-13, 19-31, 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Hemphill in view of Connelly is believed to have been overcome.

Claims 14-16 and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,779,044. U.S. Patent 6,779,044 is not to Zintel, and Applicants assume the Examiner meant U.S. Patent 6,779,004 to Zintel (hereinafter Zintel). The Examiner stated that Zintel discloses sending event registration information. Event registration information has been discussed above as indicating, for example, a specific company, product, module (e.g., software module) or other information that identifies a source or sources of

forthcoming event data as well as event information that the event processing server will require in order to be able to correctly process the forthcoming event data. Zintel fails to disclose the same, and instead discloses a server that receives and processes notify messages to handle notifications from resources and sends subscribe and unsubscribe messages to receive notifications from resources. Therefore, since claims 14 and 32 disclose event registration information, while Zintel fails to disclose such, claims 14 and 32 are believed allowable over Zintel. Claims 15-16 and 33-34 depend from claim 14 or 32 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Claim 16 has been amended to more particularly recite the step of sending. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 14-16 and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Zintel is believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 17 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Zintel in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,526,442 to Stupek Jr. et al. (hereinafter Stupek). The Examiner also rejected claims 18 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Zintel in view of Connelly. Claims 17, 18, 35 and 36 depend from claim 14 or 32 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Claim 17 has been amended to further define the step of sending. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 17-18 and 35-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Zintel in view of either Stupek or Connelly is believed to have been overcome.

Claim 39 has been added and is believed allowable as it depends from a base claim which is believed allowable. Claim 39 further defines the event registration information as information that identifies a source or sources of forthcoming event data as well as event information that the event processing server will require in order to be able to correctly process the forthcoming event data. Support for this can be found in the specification as filed at page 5, lines 13-25; at page 8 lines 16-24; and at page 13, line 20 through page 15 line 5. None of the prior art of record discloses or suggest the event registration as including information that identifies a source or sources of forthcoming event data

as well as event information that the event processing server will require in order to be able to correctly process the forthcoming event data. Accordingly, claim 39 is believed allowable.

In view of the above, the Examiner's rejections are believed to have been overcome, placing claims 1-2, 45-20 and 21-39 in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and allowance hereof is respectfully requested.

If the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office deems a fee necessary, this fee may be charged to the account of the undersigned, Deposit Account No. 50-0901.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 366-9600, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

David W. Rouille, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 40,150
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 366-9600
Facsimile: (508) 616-9805
Customer No.: 022468

Attorney Docket No.: CIS01-06(4183)

Dated: March 2, 2005